



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. III.—1. *Illustrated Hand-book of Architecture.* By JAMES FERGUSSON, Esq., M. R. I. B. A. In two volumes. London. 1855. 8vo.

2. *Essays on Architecture.* By PROFESSOR GOTFRIED SEMPER, late Director of the Royal Academy of Architecture at Dresden.

THE study of ancient architecture is but of yesterday. Ever since the so-called *renaissance*, we have been talking and writing about the classic style; yet the knowledge of its origin, its growth, and its meaning has come only since the discovery and investigation of its sources in Egypt and in Assyria. We now see the most exalted passage in the history of art as a connected and intelligible chapter, instead of a parcel of stray leaves supplemented by the imaginations of modern *dilettanti*. The condition of ignorance which has prevailed, together with its natural concomitant, pedantry, has had a peculiar and mischievous effect. The amount of injury caused by our false view of classic architecture will never be rightly estimated, till the building art shall regain that vitality which has been lost for centuries. This view has represented the Greek orders as a sort of architectural dispensation, whose cause, reason, circumstances, accessories, and uses are not to be questioned, but which is only to be reduced to rule, and used for our implicit guidance. The absurdity of all this we will not stop to criticise, but only ask, in passing, a question belonging to modern architecture,—whether the view referred to would become any less absurd, if for the word *Greek* we were to substitute *Gothic*. We can derive no benefit from any bygone style by subjecting ourselves to it. On the contrary, if we would really get help from it, we must search into its ideas and principles, and study its natural history. It is this genuine, useful study which is so recent; and its first comprehensive and accessible manual is that of Mr. Fergusson. In treating of all architecture, he has adopted an arrangement of subjects which, however good for his purpose, is wholly unsuited to ours, as we intend merely to review one great chapter in architectural

history,—that which appertains to Egypt and Assyria, and their influence on the art in Greece. A few philosophers, transcending that not very useful accomplishment, ordinary architectural book-learning, have, during the last fifteen years, studied, lectured, and written about ancient architecture. Among these we take peculiar pleasure in mentioning Professor Semper of Dresden, whose valuable discoveries and deductions, never adequately collected and published, remain in the memories of his pupils. A clear, unbiased, philosophical work, embodying all the important facts in detail on this subject, is as yet wanting, and is greatly to be desired.

The earliest known, and yet the best, building in the world is the Egyptian. Peculiar in many ways, in none is it more distinguished than in this, that it is almost the sole expression of a single mighty people. The Egyptian language, of development far from perfect, was little suited to the highest literary works, though we know that it had a literature which has perished. This tongue no children remain to continue. Silent for ages, it stands petrified in the Nile valley. On that strip of green, which the river won from the desert, there grew up an architecture, majestic in form, brilliant in color, enriched with wonderful sculptured work, and inscribed from end to end, bringing down to our time the knowledge and the faith of three thousand years ago. To speak adequately of Egypt, one should not only have studied, but have seen and felt, its architecture; and even then description is not easy. Miss Martineau has here rendered a peculiar service; for to the clear and comprehensive intellect, and the quick sympathy which the subject demands, she joins the power of graphic and picturesque narration. We cannot speak of Egypt without acknowledging our debt to her.

Egyptian architecture is strongly local. Though it taught the world, it never left its own home. Indigenous by the Nile, five centuries of rule over Assyria could not transplant it to the Euphrates. The river and the desert in their endless contest:—hence Egypt with its theology, its whole form of life, and its architecture. Again, this style shows a most persistent vitality. After the nine hundred years of foreign domination under the Shepherd Kings, the ancient art re-

appeared in full vigor. After the two hundred years of barbarous Persian rule, the native style rose for the third time great; and at last, in its extreme old age, it died a natural death, dissolving slowly into the Roman civilization.

The Egyptian temples completely expressed the religious life of the nation. Containing in their innermost depths the sanctuary of the higher mysterious worship, they included also the dwellings of the king and the priestly class; and the great halls and courts were the scenes of religious pageants and ceremonies for the people. The great feature of the building is the all-enclosing, massive wall, receding upward, full of stability and repose, and swelling into vast propylæa at the front. Within, as in the great hall at Karnac, colossal and brilliantly colored columns rise in multitudes, yet never appear outside the mighty wall which shuts them in,—as the bark of the palm, still unbroken, encloses its inward growth. The two central rows rise higher than the rest, and through the break thus made in the roof streams in the golden sunshine of Africa. This light from above falls aslant far in among the columns, yet fails to penetrate the whole depth. The interior is not dark, but interminable.

The entrance to these temples lay through fair and solemn sculptures. Nor were the graceful obelisks wanting there, while from afar looked down the colossi, majestic and serene through the ages.

Lastly, we have the tombs cut in the living rock; where were shut in, not only the man, but his works; where he lay down amid the sculptured story of his life,—a story without an end, broken off in the telling.

Apart from all the rest stand those early royal tombs replete with history,—the Pyramids. They are much older than the temples. Excelling in but few elements of architecture, they are yet the solemn prelude to all the grand harmony that followed. “The *early* Egyptians,” says Mr. Fergusson, “built neither for beauty nor for use, but for eternity.”

The painted and sculptured walls in the oldest pyramids display an art which had reached its culmination, while the remains of buildings belonging to the same age show a style

just emerging from wooden forms ; thus indicating that the pyramids were built near the commencement of stone architecture in Egypt. The inference from these facts is that the Egyptians had learned painting and sculpture by practising them in another material. Now the aboriginal art of Egypt was that of pottery ; and the forms afterward cut in stone had doubtless been previously elaborated on vases. This becomes still clearer in tracing to their origin the subsequent architectural forms. There are two columnal types variously combined and modified. One is the square stone pier, rendered by cornering eight, sixteen, and thirty-two sided, and, finally, fluted. The other, that with bell-shaped top, shows by its form and by its ornamental treatment the recollections of ceramic art. Both capital and base seem evolved ; the column sometimes even contracting just above the base like a vase, and irresistibly recalling the potter's wheel, which had whirled out its forms of clay long ere the temples began to be. This type of column,—used in the earliest and grandest temple, the great Karnac hall,—we may call peculiarly Egyptian.

Assyrian architecture presents a complete contrast, and indeed seems complementary, to Egyptian. It belongs perhaps to all the early building world except the valley of the Nile. Remembering the dominant Egyptian wall, we are struck at once with the negation of this feature in Assyrian building. First comes an immense terrace of Cyclopean masonry, mounted by the most grand and imposing flights of steps ever constructed. On this marvellous platform stood vast palatial edifices, well representing the politico-religious system of Assyria,—a deified royalty, the monarch offering to the gods the worship he himself received from the people. The wall, about seventeen feet high, and of enormous thickness, was so treated, both within and without, that it lost altogether the massive effect of masonry, the structure of unburnt bricks being lined, for the first nine feet, with finely carved alabaster slabs, and, for the remaining height, richly decorated in color. Above, (adopting the admirable plan of restoration suggested by Mr. Fergusson,) was a second or roof story of wood. On the top of the great walls, on an area about equal to that of the

lower apartments, stood long rows of finely-wrought columns with bracket capitals, supporting the roof-timbers. Between these columns the bright Eastern daylight reached the lower rooms indirectly, or was excluded at pleasure by means of curtains. Meanwhile the galleries thus formed on the wall-tops were, in cool, fine weather, the pleasantest part of the building. The roof-story and the terrace are the dominant features of this architecture. The palace was adorned throughout with admirable sculpture, painting, and inscription. At the portals stood the majestic winged bulls, and on the walls within were the well-known bass-reliefs. The prevalence of winged figures is remarkable, and is perfectly in keeping with a style of building the most light and brilliant that ever existed. These ancient slabs are so full of meaning, that they are telling us now the true story of an empire which perished at the dawn of written history.

In Assyria, as in Egypt, the sculptures from the oldest monuments are the best. There were, chronologically, two Assyrian empires, separated by five hundred years of Egyptian domination, and all the remains found belong to the second period. We cannot suppose that their arts were derived from Egypt; for their character is utterly unlike anything Egyptian. This character gives the strongest evidence of the prior material in which the artistic forms were elaborated. Not only the whole ornamentation, but also the manner in which it is used, is animated by the recollections of textile work. Whether we consider the lining of the wall below, where the rich tapestry has stiffened into stone, or the brick-work above, clothed with soft, deep colors, or the curled volutes hanging around the columns, or direct our attention to the ornamental forms themselves,—the same patterns now worked on the royal dress, now swaying in the gorgeous curtain, and anon adorning the palace wall (the sculptures even containing elaborate pictures embroidered on robes reproduced in stone),—all everywhere speak of the Assyrian loom, the oldest and most famous of the world. We find this style of ornamental art pervading a vast area. It prevailed in Asia Minor, and, previously to the Hellenic civilization, in Greece, as well as in Mesopotamia. It has a name, unobjectionable

because not liable to be misunderstood,—that of Ionic. It is impossible to believe that this style could have been thus elaborated, and have been so diffused as to become domesticated as early as we find it among distant and stranger tribes, had it originated in the capitals of the second Assyrian period. On the contrary, we have no reason to suppose the style less ancient than that of Egypt, the two nations having been, from time immemorial, competitors in power and civilization. We must then refer the Ionic art to the first Assyrian empire. It is an interesting question whether its originators were akin to the rulers of the second empire. The remains found among the Pelasgian tribes of the West are all sepulchres, while the monuments in the Eastern capitals are exclusively palatial, there being no evidence that the masters of these cities cared for their dead. From this we might be sure that these two races were not nearly related; and we know, besides, of the latter, that they were akin to the Jews, both from their intimate intercourse and from the close similarity between the Assyrian palaces and the buildings of Solomon. Now, among the Pelasgians, the Ionic style is so deeply rooted as to appear indigenous with them and their kindred. If so, its originators were not nearly related to the people dominant in Assyria during the period to which the palatial remains belong. We know that the empire was composed of three nations, with three languages, all written in the cuneiform character. We may suppose that the tomb-builders were one of these, the palace-builders another, and that the third people were the Persians. We are not ready to admit, however, that these tribes represented the whole human race. Mr. Fergusson uses the terms Tartar, Semitic, and Aryan, to which it may be objected, that they involve theories which, though generally admitted, have recently been called in question by high ethnological authority, as a single glance at the system of Dr. Bodichon will show. This distinguished savant ascribes all ancient architecture to the "brown race," a strongly defined type of humanity, distinct alike from the blonde man of Northern Europe, the yellow man of Eastern Asia, and the black man of Southern Africa; there being one exception to this state-

ment, namely, the Egyptians, whom he considers a mixed race,—brown and black.

The part played by the Persians in architectural history is sufficiently evident. Educated by contact with their more civilized neighbors, they still possessed an inherent strength which the others had lost. From the time of the great Cyrus, they succeeded to that glorious heritage, the Assyrian architecture, which they modified and improved. Under their vigorous touch, the delicate wooden columns turned to stone at Persepolis; and the old style was treated with such freshness and power as to reach its culmination.

But a far greater artistic triumph was in progress in the West. The ancient woof of Ionic art extended, as we have seen; over Greece, whose intimate connection with Asia was at length sundered by the Trojan war. Then followed centuries of change and growth; and then, about the year 650 B. C., grafted on the old Pelasgian stock, appeared the Hellenic architecture. That a new people then became dominant in Greece is doubtless true, though we must here again question the assumption that they were a separate type of humanity.

During the transition period which Mr. Fergusson well calls the “dark ages of Greece,” the rising people were not left to themselves. The highest, the most ancient art-instruction of the world, was imparted to them; and the source of that instruction was Egypt. It is now impossible to deny the influence of Egyptian ideas on the Greek temple. Too much has been made of the resemblance between the so-called proto-Doric of Egypt and the Parthenon order. What they have in common was the least salient characteristic of the Egyptian columns, and was, in fact, one at which both nations might have rapidly arrived by nearly the same steps. The distinctive feature of the Doric order is the wonderfully curved echinus capital. This is wholly Grecian,—there being full evidence that it did not exist elsewhere. Perhaps the true statement would then be, not that the Egyptians gave to Greece the Doric order, but that they taught the men of the Dorian civilization to build. How those wonderful pupils “bettered the instruction” is well known.

The Doric was the great order of Greece. Peculiarly her own, it was born and it died with her. The Ionic order, naturally occupying the second place,—that of a superseded civilization,—flourished only where the influence of the Pelasgians still lingered; then, with the Ionian colonies, returned to its native Asia, where it lasted till it was lost in the Roman empire. Meantime, the old Ionic ornamentation pervaded and adorned the whole Grecian architecture.

We must now return once more to the great hall of Karnac, and those glorious columns which we described as peculiarly Egyptian. This type the Greeks, in their later civilization, adorned with the acanthus-leaf and the Ionic volute, and thus created the Corinthian order. Originating in the ceramic forms of Egypt, and stamped with the collective art of Greece, it passed to Rome, destined not to die in her civilization, but to survive her power.

The great feature of the Greek temple is its columnar system, including entablature, pediment, and roof. The wall is a subordinate feature, appearing in the perfected style entirely surrounded by columns. The temples were of fine white marble, and were not only enriched with the greatest sculptures of the world, but were also brilliantly decorated with color. We believe, with Professor Semper, who himself carefully examined the remains in Greece, that the temple was colored throughout, the surface of the marble being first prepared with a coating like lime-putty. The walls were probably covered with fresco pictures, while the columnar or roof system was treated in such a manner as to heighten the effect of its exquisite proportions and outline.

Here let us pause for a moment, to compare the artistic developments of Persia and Greece,—the Eastern and the Western culminations of ancient architecture. The despotism received from others, and brought to perfection a lovely ancient style. The republic inherited from Asia, learned from Egypt, and wrought out for itself the most noble architecture of the world.

It is not a pleasant task to vindicate what we wish only to study and admire. As, however, there has been a loud rattling among the whitened bones of our architecture against the

warm colors of vigorous Grecian life, — modern prejudice even refusing to admit the clearest evidence of polychromatic decoration, — we would say a few words in defence of the Greek usage in this particular. To the objection urged, that it was wrong to cover up the costly marble, we reply, that the object of the Greeks was not to show the excellence of their material. Having made sure that the stone was suitable and precious, their next thought was to render it beautiful. To those who contend that an harmoniously colored exterior is not beautiful, we would suggest that they are condemning that of which they have probably no experimental knowledge.

We would not, however, quarrel with the disposition to question even Greek artistic usages. Let us, in our architectural barbarism, have at least the grace of honesty, and not pretend to admire what we do not really feel. No deference to authority will help us. Only through humble, unprejudiced, and patient study can our architecture gain light and life. Our motto should be, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

ART. IV.—*Discourse on the Life and Virtues of the Rev. Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, late Pastor of St. Michael's Church, Loretto. Delivered on the Occasion of the Removal of his Remains to the new and splendid Monument erected to his Memory by a Grateful Flock.* By the Very Rev. THOMAS HEYDEN. Published at the earnest request of the Monumental Committee. Printed for the Monumental Committee at Loretto, Pa. 1848.

THE Church of Rome, in claiming the title of Catholic, has not neglected to assert a right to it, by sending propagandists of her faith to every quarter of the habitable earth. Whenever the discoverer or conqueror opens up new and unexplored regions, there appear almost simultaneously with him her zealous missionaries. Neither the scorching sun of India, the everlasting ice of the pole, the jealousy of Oriental gov-